

## THE PUBLIC FORUM

### TO FEDERATION OF LABOR.—

The other day I read in the Bohemian Union paper, Danny Hlasatel (daily paper), a proclamation to all Bohemians to vote for the enemy of unions, Mr. Hufmann.

The signatures were: Anton J. Cermak, Ald. Tomau, both Sabaths and Weiner.

Mr. Cermak and Weiner are the leaders of the United Societies, the same gang that put over Robert Schweitzer for Thompson to beat, the same bunch that did the same trick with Ed Dunne for Busse.

Now is the time for every union man, Socialist and I. W. W. to get even with this booze gang. This can be done only by every labor man voting for an honest liberal man, for lieutenant-governor, and I believe a Socialist lieutenant-governor would be in harmony with Ed Dunne for governor.

I am a born Bohemian, but before I would vote for a crooked Bohemian I would prefer a good and honest Irishman. In religion I am a Jew, but I prefer a liberal Catholic against a rotten non-Catholic if he is a Jew, Protestant, Lutheran, Baptist, etc.—Arnold Strauss.

### A QUESTION OF MODESTY.—

Allen Steven's right to speak for all men in regard to love, marriage, religion, politics and everything else may well be disputed. It would have been more modest and just as effective to remark that few men understand a mother's love for her child, and that among the few Allen Steven stands at the top and is entitled to instruct the rest. But some of us must object to being included in the all embracing symbol of "we men."

The loose-jointed, wild-eyed philosophy preached by Allen may have a fascination for people who feel oppression, but have not learned to think, and may lead some of the unthinking into trouble, but there are

men who object to having the leader of the cult include them in it without asking permission.

"We men" certainly don't regulate everything. A good many of us find it all we can do to regulate ourselves. Steven may be among these and, if so, he should be careful about trying to regulate everything else.

The spectacle of "we men" gathering at the bedside of mothers whose children have no fathers to assist in bringing up the children may be fascinating to perverted moral intelligence and may lead weak intellects to violate the moral law, but it is probable that the majority of men and women can see the weak and lustful and sensual that is concealed in the proposition.—George V. Wells.

**INCENTIVE.**—The commonest objection to socialism is that it will destroy incentive. To make one's argument understood, it is best to illustrate. Two men are in the grocery business. They are rivals, fighting each other for trade. After a long spell of antagonism and uphill work they conclude it is best to go into partnership and work together and cut out the time, energy and money they have wasted fighting each other, and devote this waste to schemes to increase their trade.

Nobody will contend that they have lost any incentive by going into partnership. Suppose that instead of two grocerymen there are three or more. The same principle applies. Now socialism proposes to make us all partners in business the same as we are partners in government in a democracy.

It is carrying on business democratically instead of monarchically or aristocratically. Again, socialism is team work. Take a ball club where the players are working for individual records only the club will never win a pennant. Social action is what counts. What is the real incentive for action? The good things of life, to feed, clothe, amuse, enjoy and de-